

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/045,035	RAGHUNATHAN ET AL.
	Examiner Joseph C. Merek	Art Unit 3727

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph C. Merek. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Richard P. Bauer. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 April 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed Amendment.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stahl, Miller, Loftus, Tufts, and Andrews.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed claims were discussed. Applicant will file an amendment for consideration by the examiner.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required